

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action mailed May 18, 2007.

All the rejections are respectfully traversed. Reexamination and reconsideration of the amended application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action

The Examiner objected to the claims for certain informalities and then rejected the claims for being anticipated, or failing to define nonobviousness subject matter over the teachings of primarily the principal reference of Eguchi et al. However, the Examiner's further indication of allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged

The Subject Development

The present application concerns a method for tracking internet facsimile jobs to especially identify a return message (sometimes characterized as a "bounced message") wherein an original message can be subject to transmission back to the originating internet facsimile device as a return message due to an error condition, such as a failure in transmission over the network or failure in achieving completed transmission and confirmation at the intended receiving device. Unfortunately, such a bounced message usually entails the automated printing of usually the full extent of the return message and all of its attachments. The subject development concerns methods for tracking such a facsimile job to identify when the bounced message is a result of an error condition and avoiding the printing of the incoming bounced transmission. Features are disclosed including embedding indicia in a prepared message indicative of whether the return message originated from the originating device.

The Cited Reference

The Examiner's principal reference to Eguchi et al. relates to a facsimile apparatus having disclosed methods (principally Figures 6 and 12) wherein an error condition may be detected (steps 52, Fig. 6, step 202, Figure 12) so that "another

process” (step 56 and step 210) is implemented. The Examiner correctly noted that Eguchi et al. does not specifically disclose that the return message is not printed (Office Action para. 5). In fact, Eguchi does the opposite, and suggest that the error message is printed (note paragraph 72:

“When the CPU 2 determines that it is not the delivery confirmation e-mail in S202, the normal receiving process such as printing or delivering is conducted (S210).” [emphasis added]

The Claims Distinguish Over The Teachings of the Reference

The Examiner will appreciate that claim 1 has been amended to specify that the printing of the return message is disallowed when it is determined that the message originated from the originating device. It is respectfully submitted that the method of determining that the return message is so associated with the originating device and then disallowing its printing is not shown individually or in combination by the reference or the Examiner’s taken official notice. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify this novel process.

Lastly, the comments delete the indefiniteness problems identified by the Examiner have been corrected. The Examiner’s assistance in this regard is gratefully acknowledged.

CONCLUSION


Claims 1-3, 5-12 remain in the application. For the foregoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Patrick R. Roche, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Patrick R. Roche, Reg. No. 29,580
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

November 19, 2007

Date

L:\KMF\DATA\XEROX\XEROX TEMPLATES FOR ELECTRONIC FILING\X AMENDMENT.DOCX